

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated July 3, 2007, the Examiner has again rejected claims 1, 4-10, 13 and 16-21 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Wang, U.S. Publication No. 20020159463 (“Wang”). In addition, the Examiner has again rejected claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Harvey et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,054,924 (“Harvey”). Thus, all pending claims 1-23 currently stand rejected.

Applicant again respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 1-23. Nevertheless, in order to advance the prosecution of this application as quickly as possible, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 13, and 21 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention. Support for the amendments is found throughout the specification and drawings. Applicant requests continued examination of the claims in view of the amendments to the claims and arguments as set forth in detail in the following remarks.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 4-10, 13 AND 16-21 UNDER 35 USC §102(e) OVER WANG

The Examiner has maintained her position that Wang teaches determining a protocol that defines how packets are constructed because it discloses parsing packets for source and destination addresses that are used to provide network address translation services. In response, Applicant again submits that a traffic flow specification that merely indicates how to parse a packet for forwarding the packet using a network address translation service is simply not the same as determining a protocol that defines how packets are constructed. Knowing where the source and destination addresses are located

in a packet does not define how the packet is constructed in terms of such things as, among others, encapsulations, field types, etc.

In any event, Applicant has further clarified in the independent claims that the protocol runtime specification that is built based on how packets for a protocol are constructed, further specifies how packets for that protocol should be processed by the network traffic generation and analysis tool, including how to translate them into a format for analyzing traffic in the network traffic generation and analysis tool. Nothing in Wang, either alone or in combination, discloses building a protocol runtime specification as described in the specification and recited in the claims. In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 9, 13, and 21 and their dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over Wang and, therefore, allowable. Consequently, consideration and allowance of Claims 1, 4-10, 13 and 16-21 is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2, 3, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22 AND 23 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner has maintained her position that Harvey teaches writing a file in Extensible Markup Language (XML), and that it would have been obvious to combine Harvey with Wang to write the protocol file in XML as recited in Claims 2, 11, 14, and 22. The Examiner further maintains that Harvey teaches determining from a file how to display a user interface element, and that it would have been obvious to combine Harvey with Wang to determine how to display user interface elements as recited in Claims 3, 12, 15, and 23.

In response, Applicant reiterates the position with reference to the independent claims that, regardless of whether a protocol file is written in XML, a traffic flow

specification that merely indicates how to parse a packet for forwarding the packet using a network address translation service is simply not the same as determining a protocol that defines how packets are constructed. Moreover, dependent claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22 and 23 are allowable because they depend from allowable independent claims 1, 9, 13, and 21, and because of their additional limitations. Consequently, consideration and allowance of Claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22 and 23 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-23 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: October 3, 2007

/Donna Jo Coningsby/
Donna Jo Coningsby
Reg. No. 41,684
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778